

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 105

SP 039 156

AUTHOR Turanli, Adem Sultan; Yildirim, Ali
TITLE A Comparative Assessment of Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment in Classes of a High Control and a Low Control Teacher through Student Perceptions and Class Observations.
PUB DATE 1999-12-12
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Techniques; Discipline; Foreign Countries; Secondary Education; *Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Expectations of Students; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Turkey

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and their students' classroom behaviors and the learning environment. Two teachers with different orientations (non-interventionist and interventionist) to classroom management were selected, and their 91 students were administered the Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment Questionnaire. The questionnaire included two scales: student classroom behaviors (12 items) and learning environment (9 items). The students were also administered an opinionnaire, and a student sample was interviewed for further data. The classes of the two teachers were observed to gather more in-depth data on how the students behaved and what sort of learning environment was created in their classes. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The analysis indicated that student behaviors and the learning environment in the classes of the two teachers with different orientations differed significantly on both scales. (Contains 52 references.) (Author/SM)

**A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT CLASSROOM BEHAVIORS AND
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN CLASSES OF A HIGH CONTROL AND A LOW
CONTROL TEACHER THROUGH STUDENT PERCEPTIONS AND CLASS
OBSERVATIONS**

Adem Sultan Turanli

Ali Yildirim

Middle East Technical University

Faculty of Education

06531, Ankara, Turkey

tel: 90-312-210 4027

fax: 90-31- 210 1254

e-mail: a12268@tutor.fedu.metu.edu.tr

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Yildirim

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent

Abstract

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and their students' classroom behaviors and the learning environment. Two teachers with different orientations (noninterventionist and interventionist) to classroom management were selected and their students (N=91) were administered the "Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment Questionnaire." The questionnaire included two scales: student classroom behaviors (12 items) and learning environment (9 items). The students were also administered an opinionnaire and a student sample were interviewed for further data. The classes of the two teachers were also observed to gather more in-depth data on how the students behaved and what sort of learning environment was created in the classes of the two teachers. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The analysis indicated that student behaviors and the learning environment in the classes of the two teachers with different orientations differed significantly in both scales.

Introduction

Teachers' Orientations to Classroom Management

There are various factors that influence teachers' orientations to how they would like to manage their classrooms. Their goals, values, and beliefs about classroom management will undoubtedly affect their decisions about the management system that they would like to establish (Burden, 1995; Martin, & Baldwin, 1992; Martin, & Baldwin, 1994; Martin, & Yin, 1997). Abdullah (1992) claims that classroom management is often based on a teacher's preconceived or acquired principles that normally divide things into "right" and "wrong" categories. Depending on these categories, they make rules to manage their classes.

Teachers' beliefs about classroom management and control may be classified in various ways. Burden (1995) states that the extent to which teachers want to exercise control in their classrooms is the fundamental question when deciding on their approaches to management and discipline in the literature. Burden suggests a framework based on the degree of control that teachers exert on the students and the classroom. Wolfgang and Glickman (1995) offers a classification of low, medium and high control.

According to low control approaches to classroom control, students have to control their own behavior and they have the capacity to make these decisions. The child's thoughts, feelings, ideas, and preferences are taken into account when dealing with instruction, management, and discipline. The teacher has to structure the environment to facilitate students' control over their own behavior. When rules are made, teachers guide the discussion and help students recognize appropriate behavior and select related rules and consequences. (Burden, 1995; Wolfgang, & Glickman, 1995; Charles, 1996). The Ginott model (Ginott, 1972), group management (Redl, & Wattenberg, 1959; Redl, 1972), and transactional analysis (Berne, 1964; Harris, 1967) are low control approaches to classroom control.

Medium control approaches are based on the belief that the teacher and students are jointly responsible for student behavior. Although they accept student-centered psychology, teachers of medium control approaches think that learning takes place in a group context. Hence, the teacher encourages individual student control over behavior whenever possible. However, the teacher places the needs of the group as a whole over the needs of the individual students. The child's thoughts, feelings, ideas, and preferences are taken into account when dealing with instruction, management, and discipline, but the teacher's primary

focus is on behavior and meeting the academic needs of the group. Students are given opportunities to control their behavior to help them develop the ability to make appropriate decisions (Burden, 1995; Wolfgang & Glickman, 1995; Charles, 1996). The Dreikurs model (Dreikurs, Grundwahl, & Pepper, 1982) the Glasser model (Glasser, 1969), and the Kounin model (Kounin, 1970) are medium control approaches to classroom management (Burden, 1995).

According to high control approaches, the students' growth and development are the result of external conditions. Children are seen to be molded and shaped by influences from their environment. Therefore, teachers need to select desired student behaviors, reinforce appropriate behaviors, and take actions to extinguish inappropriate behaviors. Students' thoughts, feelings, and preferences are given little attention since adults are more experienced in instructional matters and have the responsibility for choosing what is best for student development and behavior control. The rules and procedures are developed by teachers commonly without input from students. Teachers are to reinforce desired behavior and take actions to have students stop inappropriate, undesired behavior (Burden, 1995). The Jones model (Jones, 1987), the Skinner model (Skinner, 1971; Tauber, 1982), and the Canter model (Canter, & Canter, 1992) are high control approaches to classroom management (Burden, 1995).

Student Classroom Behaviors

People in groups behave differently than they do individually. Groups usually take on an identity and personality of their own, and group dynamics may affect and change group personalities (Burden, 1995). The teacher should first understand the multiple interactive features of the ecosystem in which student behavior occurs in order to be an effective classroom manager. Teachers must always recognize the individual differences among their students since the students' individual personalities, aptitudes, and backgrounds significantly differ.

The responses to any kind of misbehavior vary considerably from teacher to teacher (Kameenui, & Craig, 1995). Some student actions that appear to be quite similar are reacted to differently by teachers when the actions are performed by students at different times or in different contexts (Doyle, 1986). In this differential treatment, teachers may react differently

when considering context of the student actions. Swick (1987) indicated the importance of understanding the context of student behavior and identifying student behavior problems early.

To understand students' misbehavior, teachers need to view what students do in the context of the classroom structure (Mehan, Hertweck, Combs, & Flynn, 1982) and students' misbehavior should be interpreted based on what the teacher knows about the likely configuration of events (Hargraves, Hester, & Mellor, 1975). Therefore, teachers need to make reliable judgments about the probable consequences of students' actions in different situations (Burden, 1995). Expert teachers see classrooms as moving systems and make managerial decisions based on their perceptions of how well students are working (Evertson, & Harris, 1992).

Without an understanding of the students' perspective on classroom management, conflicts between students and teachers will continue to lead to ineffective classroom management and negative learning and teaching experiences. However, Allen (1986) argues that existing research has handled classroom management dominantly from teachers' perspectives, and students' perspectives have been neglected.

Burden (1995) defines misbehavior as any student behavior that is perceived by the teacher to compete with or threaten the academic actions at a particular moment, and creates disruptions in the flow of classroom activities. Even if the needs of the students are the same, the behavior they choose to satisfy them are likely to differ significantly, and that behavior is always their best attempt to satisfy their needs (Glasser, 1992). Teachers' responses to any kind of misbehavior vary considerably from teacher to teacher according to how they perceive the misbehavior and their approach to classroom management (Kameenui, & Darch, 1995).

Misbehavior is closely related to the context and consequently how the teacher interprets the classroom occurrences (Mehan et al., 1982). Doyle (1986) suggests interpreting any misbehavior only in context of the classroom structures where it occurs. Zabel and Zabel (1996) suggest answering the questions where, when, how often and under what conditions the behavior occurs and how it affects other aspects of classroom environment.

6

Learning Environment

Learning environment is an important determinant of whether learning can occur in any classroom. Effective communication skills are the foundation for good classroom management. Caring interpersonal interactions are essential in meeting such important individual needs as safety and security, belongingness, and self-esteem (Jones, & Jones, 1995).

Each person is affected by the behaviors of the people they are in contact with. Only in an environment where the relations are based on mutual respect, it is possible to create a good learning environment. When students display desired behaviors in class, the teacher in that class will be affected positively. Student behavior is often affected by the quantity and quality of interpersonal interactions of teachers and peers (Cangelosi, 1988).

Student learning gains are most closely related to the general climate of learning that exists in the school, and that in turn is linked to such variables as teacher relationships with students, affective teacher variables such as gaining student respect and forming good relationships with students appear to be particularly important (Good, Biddle, & Brophy, 1975).

A good climate is warm, supportive and pleasant with an air of friendliness, good nature, and acceptance. Such a climate is encouraging and helpful, with a low level of threats. Such a climate encourages work and promotes a sense of enjoyment and accomplishment for everyone (Charles, 1996). Healthy and happy classrooms require that teachers be committed to students and act in ways worthy of their respect, help children improve their self-esteem, employ consistency, offer students choices, and be willing to readjust your plans to meet student needs (McCloskey, 1996).

Positive communication is another important determinant of good learning environment. As well as teacher-student relations, relations among students play an important role in determining the quality of the learning environment (Jones, & Jones, 1995). Successful achievement of classroom objectives depends upon effective interactions among teachers and students. What is ideal is that both teacher and student experience satisfaction in the classroom (Comish, Rader, Kritsonis, Daboval and Northam, 1996).

There are lots of teacher behaviors which lead to student misbehavior such as being overly negative, maintaining an authoritarian climate, overreacting to situations, using mass punishment (Moskowitz, & Hayman, 1976). A threatening environment may cause students to work under coercion, making them dislike both teacher and the school (Lemlech, 1988). As the most critical determinant of the classroom environment, the classroom teacher has the biggest responsibility for guiding the learning and behavior that occur in the classroom. This responsibility adds a positive, creative dimension into teachers' professional life (Zabel, & Zabel, 1996).

In a study investigating the function of teachers' reflection with the teaching and learning environment, Tsangaridou and Osullivan (1997) found that the type of reflection were situationally driven and contextually bound, and the type of reflection that informs teachers' practices over time influences changes in the teachers' classroom practice. In a study conducted to determine teachers' perceptions regarding the need for change in organizational management of traditional classrooms, Nash (1991) found that most teachers manage their classrooms from the traditional bureaucratic organizational management philosophy although most teachers stated that they would prefer to employ a flexible model of organizational management in their classrooms. In addition, the study indicated that teachers who employ the flexible model perceive a higher degree of success than those who implement other models.

Research also indicates that teachers approach teaching differently in different learning environments. In line with this thought, Prosser and Trigwell (1997) studied university teachers' perceptions of their teaching environment and how those perceptions related to their approaches to teaching. They found that there were systematic relations between the perceptions and approaches, and that the adoption of a conceptual change and student-focused approach to teaching is associated with perceptions that the teacher has control over what is taught and how it is taught. In a study exploring teachers' perceptions of effective classroom management, Turner (1991) found that teachers based their perceptions of effective classroom management on an elaborate system of beliefs, and that teachers demonstrated an overwhelming concern with constructing and enforcing rules and with restricting students' interactions and movements, teachers had significantly lowered academic and behavioral expectations.

In a survey study, Ellis and Kidwell (1995) showed that conflict resolution and the democratic process were important in classroom management. The results of the study also suggested that teachers should choose a classroom management process that suits them, their students, and subject to be taught, and that students should be encouraged to be active members of classroom management and the discipline process.

Also, in a study conducted by Wragg (1995) of effective classroom management with particular emphasis on how teachers deal with deviant or disruptive behavior, it was found that there is a lack of congruence between the pupils' perception and that of the teachers. The study also revealed that a particular strategy that teachers frequently use may not work because of the way it is perceived by their pupils. In a research report exploring practices that teachers can use to respond to behavior problems in their classes, Swick (1987) indicated the importance of understanding the context of student behavior and identifying student behavior problems early.

In a study investigating whether the incongruence between students' expectations and perceptions of teacher management behaviors in ELT classes differed according to some background variables, Turanlı (1995) indicated that the incongruence differed significantly according to perceived performance in English, their attitude toward learning English, and their status (new or repeat students). In a study investigating the effects of the congruence between the preferred and actual classroom environments on students' learning, Wong and Watkins (1996) found that the congruence between the preferred and actual classroom environments affects students' learning and the more their expectations are met, the more successful the students are. Also, in a study conducted by Durmuşçelebi (1996), it was found that there are significant differences between what students expect of their teachers and what they perceive them to do and that there were significant differences between what the students observe their teachers do and what the teachers claim to do. Deng (1991) conducted a study to determine the relationships between class climate factors and student mathematics achievement and found that class climate factors affect mathematics achievement differently depending on student characteristics.

Waxman and Huang (1997) investigated whether there are significant differences between effective and ineffective schools in terms of students' classroom behavior and students' motivation and perceptions of their classroom learning environment. Their study

showed that students from effective schools worked more in an individualized setting, interacted more with their teachers, and worked more on written assignments. How the classroom is managed and what kind of climate is created in the classroom have been proven to have a bearing on student learning. In a study conducted by Kısakürek (1985), many components of learning environment were perceived by the students to be influential to their learning.

Along with the above-mentioned factors, teachers' different styles may result in different outcomes in the classroom in terms of student behaviors and the learning environment. Thus it seems important to explore possible relations between teachers' orientations, student behaviors and the learning environment, how these factors interact. With these points in mind, the purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between teachers' orientations to classroom management and student classroom behaviors, and the learning environment in ELT classes, and explain how student behaviors and the learning environment interact..

Method

Study Design

The study was conducted at the English Preparatory School at Erciyes University, in Turkey, in the second semester of the 1996-1997 school year. The subjects of the study were the students and the teachers at the English Preparatory School. Two teachers with different orientations to classroom management were identified based on informal conversations, their positions in the faculty meetings, and later informal observations and interviews related to their orientations to managing their classrooms. The students of these two teachers were administered a questionnaire on student classroom behaviors and learning environment in order to understand their perceptions about how the students behaved in their classes and how the learning environment was perceived by the students. The students were administered an opinionnaire and two students from each class were interviewed in order to obtain more in-depth descriptive data on how the students behaved in class and how they perceived the learning environment. In addition, the classes of the two teachers were observed in order to validate the data gathered through the other instruments, and gather more in-depth descriptive data.

Population and Sample Selection

The population included the 890 students and the 31 teachers in the English Preparatory School at Erciyes University. The criteria for selecting the two teachers for the study were teaching experience of at least three years, willingness to participate in the study, openness to talk about his/her conceptions and perceptions on classroom management. 91 students of these two teachers in 4 classes constituted the student sample, and all they responded to the study questionnaire described below. One of the teachers was teaching 43 students and the second 48.

Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed based on the related literature to explore students' perceptions of their own behaviors and the learning environment. This questionnaire "Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment Questionnaire" included 21 items in two scales: student classroom behaviors and learning environment. Below these scales were described briefly.

- Student Classroom Behaviors (items aiming to identify how the students chose to behave in the classes of the teachers),
- Learning Environment (items aiming to investigate how happy and satisfied the students were in the classes of their teachers).

The students were asked to respond to the items in the questionnaire on a five-point Likert type scale from "never" to "always." A pilot study was conducted to assess the reliability of the questionnaire with 34 students in one class in the same school. The Alpha reliabilities were calculated separately for the two scales. The reliability was calculated .784 for student classroom behaviors and .825 for learning environment.

Opinionnaire on Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment

"Opinionnaire on Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment" was developed by the researcher and contained open-ended questions exploring the reasons for students' misbehaviors in class and the components affecting the learning environment.

Interview Schedule on Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment

An interview schedule was prepared in order to obtain more in-depth data on student classroom behaviors and learning environment. After piloting the instrument with students from different classes, a total of 8 students (two from each class) were interviewed individually. The interviews were semi-structured. Each student was interviewed twice for not less than 15 minutes.

Observation Schedule

An observation schedule was prepared in line with the research question and was revised based on the data obtained through "Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment Questionnaire". The two classes of each teacher (a total of four classes) were observed by the researcher for two sessions of fifty minutes (a total of eight sessions). The focus of the observations was limited to the research question. The observations provided more data on how the students of these teachers behaved and observe how the learning environment was in these classes and how the classes of the two teachers differed in these terms. The data were used qualitatively and content analyzed.

The data were gathered from the two teachers and their students selected for the study in the second semester of the 1996-1997 school year. First, a total of 94 students in the classes of the two teachers responded to the Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment Questionnaire and Opinionnaire on Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment. While the data from the questionnaire and the opinionnaire were being analyzed, observations were carried out in the classes of the sampled teachers. In line with the data from the preliminary observations, an observation schedule was developed, and the classrooms of the two teachers were observed considering the points in the schedule. The later observations were more focused on how the teachers behaved and differed in their management behaviors. In line with the data obtained through other instruments, an interview schedule was developed to obtain more in-depth data and piloted.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. First, the responses of the students to the "Student Classroom Behaviors and Learning Environment

Questionnaire" were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, and means. When calculating the mean for each item, in line with Likert-type scales, 1 was assigned to "never", 2 to "rarely", 3 to "sometimes", 4 to "often", and 5 to "always". The frequencies, percentages and the means of the items were presented under the two scales. When the means for the scales were calculated, the negative items were reversed as 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2 and 5=1. Based on the students' responses to the items in any scale, mean scores for the scales were found by calculating the means for the items in the scales. These mean scores were used to examine whether there were any differences between the two teachers. For this analysis, t-test was used as a statistical procedure.

The data from the opinionnaire, interviews, and observations were subjected to content analysis to explore students' differing behavior patterns and learning environments in relation to the teachers' different orientations to classroom management. These patterns were presented in relation to the questionnaire data.

Profile of the Teachers

Below a profile for each teacher selected for this study was presented based on the data obtained through class observations. The low control teacher was called TA, whereas the high control teacher was called TB for practical purposes.

TA: The teacher gives priority to the students' needs and interests and does not want to hurt the students due to the academic reasons. S/he believes that when students are well motivated, they can often overcome their problems and some problems can and should be ignored if they do not disturb the students in the class. S/he believes that a good atmosphere contributes to the learning environment and student learning. Therefore, s/he often has a smiling face in the classroom and at the beginning of the lesson, s/he has a short talk with the class. S/he also lets in the students who come later than him/her. S/he walks around the students to monitor their personal or group work and s/he often has personal interactions (on-task or off-task) with the students. The teacher often does not attempt to prevent off-task interaction among students. In case of misbehavior, the teacher often uses his/her gestures and mimics to stop misbehaviors.

TB: The teacher gives priority to the tasks and does not hesitate to scold the student due to their misbehavior. S/he thinks that the first days of a course determines how students tend to behave later. Therefore, s/he needs to manage his/her class carefully in the first days. According to him/her, a well-managed class will enjoy success since more time spent on tasks will lead to more learning. S/he thinks that students tend to abuse their teacher's goodwill since they are not

mature enough. Therefore, s/he rarely smiles during the lesson. S/he does not allow students to enter the classroom late, and controls students' behaviors closely to prevent misbehaviors. The teacher rarely walks around the students to monitor their work. In addition, s/he does not create opportunities for interaction often except question-answer sessions. The teacher almost always stands by his/her desk, and seems prepared for the lesson. S/he tries to create a context where there is a smooth lesson flow and the transitions are very clear.

Results

Below the data obtained from the questionnaire, opinionnaire, interviews and class observations are presented separately for each scale in the instrument. First the data from the questionnaire are tabulated in frequencies, percentages, and means. Second, the data from the opinionnaire, interviews and class observations are presented.

Student Behaviors

The first section of the questionnaire consisted of 12 items on student classroom behaviors aiming to identify how students behaved in the lessons of the teacher. The students' responses to these items were displayed in Table 1 in percentages, means and standard deviations.

As the means in Table 1 indicate, the classes of the teachers did not differ in terms of willing participation in the classroom activities. The students responded that they, more than sometimes, willingly participated in the classroom activities. However, it was found that more of the students of TB followed the lesson flow than those of TA. A great majority of the students (%83.4) of TB responded that when any student in their classes was speaking, the others listened more than often ($M=4.19$), whereas the students of TA listened to their friends less often when they were was speaking. The students responded that the students in the classes of TB almost never chatted without permission while in the classes of TA, the students sometimes chatted without permission. In line with the students' behavior of listening to their friends, the students of TB listened to their teacher attentively more than often ($M=4.21$) while the students of TA did so only somewhat more frequently than sometimes ($M=3.37$). ..

Table 1 about here

The students responded that the classes of TA were interrupted due to disruptive behaviors while in the classes of TB, the lesson flow was hardly ever interrupted. In the classes of TA, one-third of the students responded that the lesson flow was sometimes interrupted. Similarly, in the classes of TB, the students hardly ever misbehaved at any chance while in the classes of TA, certain students sometimes misbehaved at any chance.

However, almost all the students in all the classes responded that they avoided misbehaving. Similarly, almost all the students stated that they often tried to do the classroom tasks as carefully as they could while the students of TA had a comparatively higher mean ($M=4.30$). In the same line, the students of TA responded that they tried to contribute to the class more often than those of TB. However, in the classes of TA, more students conducted various behaviors to show their feelings when they were bored than those of TB. Almost all of the students (%95.7) of TB responded that they often or always avoided behaviors that were likely to distract their friends.

When a composite mean score was calculated to represent the students' behaviors as a whole, the students in the classes of TB had a higher score than those students in the classes of TA. A t-test indicated that there was a significant difference between the classes of the teachers in terms of students' behaviors at the .05 level, indicating that there were more distractions and less productivity in TA's classes than TB's. While the students of TA more often conducted misbehavior (mostly moderate), hardly ever was there any misbehavior in the classes of TB.

Table 2 about here

It was observed that the students of TA more willingly participated in the activities sometimes with their hands up asking for permission and sometimes calling out. However, the teacher ignored the students' calling out and this behavior encouraged the students to call out. On the other hand, the students of TB were unwilling to participate in the activities. While almost all the students of TB attentively followed the lesson flow and in the classes of TA, many students were following the lesson flow in spite of the noise. In line with this, it was also observed that the students of TB silently listened to their friends while one of their friends was talking. However, in the classes of TA, some students were observed to be

speaking when a student was speaking related to the topic studied. Besides, many students in the classes of TA did not avoid whispering to their friends.

There were moments of too much noise in the classes of TA. When the noise was too high, TA stopped to warn the students although TB never needed to warn the students, indicating the need that the teacher should be careful about the balance between permissiveness and strictness. However, in the classes of TA, more students were observed to be trying to contribute to the class, by answering the questions posed to the whole class. Similarly, when they were asked to do some task, almost all the students seemed to be willing to do it but with some chatting with their partners. However, in the classes of TB the students seemed less willing to contribute to the class. This finding shows that warm atmosphere leads to students' willingness to participate in classroom activities in exchange of possible misbehaviors, indicating the need for a deliberate consideration of teacher management behaviors likely to provoke student misbehavior.

In response to questions in the opinionnaires, some students of TA stated that although they wanted to participate in the activities, they were disturbed by students who continuously spoke without permission. This was stated to prevent the other students from concentrating on the topics and to lead to more misbehavior. Some students of TA added that student misbehaviors and arguing with the teachers decreased the students' interest in learning. They expected their teacher to overcome such problems. The students claimed that when the teacher could not overcome such problems, s/he often lost the control of the class, which led to more misbehaviors.

On the other hand, the students of TB stated that due to the strict atmosphere, they were reluctant to participate in the activities. The students of TA stated that most students were willing to follow the lesson flow while some students purposefully refused to do so since they were bored in the classroom. On the other hand, the students of TB stated that they were often bored in class; however, they rarely attempted to misbehave. Similarly, many students of TA stated that there were a lot of students in class who chatted with others while a student or the teacher was speaking. On the other hand, the students of TB stated that there was almost nobody in their classes to dare to speak without permission.

The students of TA argued that other students' reluctant behaviors negatively influenced them. Over time, they had also lost their enthusiasm in learning and participating.

Still, some students in the classes of TA stated that since they were sure of their teachers' willingness to teach and help the students, they tried to do their best. The students in the classes of TB claimed that although their classes were boring, most students did their tasks as carefully as they could, not only because of their teacher's strict attitude but also because they believed that the silence in the classroom contributed to their learning.

In the interviews, the students of TA complained about the frequent misbehaviors of their classmates such as speaking without permission and arguing with the teacher. It is said that there were certain students who very often abused the teacher's goodwill, which frustrated the teacher and made him/her reprimand the students from time to time. In the interviews, the students of TA complained that when certain students conducted misbehavior, the teacher mostly ignored them, resulting in more problems caused by the others. They claimed that if the teacher had prevented such misbehaviors when they first occurred, the students would have avoided misbehaving. However, the students in the classes of TB did not mention any behavior problems in the interviews that had occurred in their classrooms except a few at the very beginning of the year, which were stopped by the teacher by reprimanding the students severely who caused the problems. These students stated that they were aware that any misbehavior would be similarly prevented with a severe reproach.

In addition, the students stated that when they clearly knew the rules and procedures to be followed, they tried to misbehave less often. In addition, when the students came to the class prepared for the next class, they less often misbehaved, liked learning more, and found it easier to learn.

Learning Environment

The second section of the questionnaire included 9 items on learning environment, aiming to investigate how happy and how satisfied the students were in the classes of their teachers. The data from the questionnaire are presented in Table 3.

Only half of the students of TA responded that they were often or always happy in the classes of the teacher while more than two-thirds of the students of TA claimed to feel often or always happy to be in their classes. However, there were still some students in the classes of the two teachers who did not feel happy at all. The questionnaire data indicated that in the classes of TA, certain students more than sometimes laughed at their friends due to various

reasons. However, in the classes of TB, this student behavior was claimed to hardly ever occur. In terms of being fairly treated, not many of the respondents felt that their teacher treated them unfairly more than sometimes. However, again, the students of TA felt so, comparatively more frequently than those of TB. In addition, the students responded that they had enjoyable time in the classes of their teachers more than sometimes. However, more than twenty percent of the students of TB responded that they had enjoyable lessons in the classes of their teacher hardly ever or never.

Table 3 about here

A t-test indicated that there was a significant difference between the classes of the two teachers at the .05 level in terms of the learning environment. The composite mean scores showed that the students in the classrooms of TB felt much better than those of TA, indicating that TB could create a better learning environment than TA.

Table 4 about here

The data obtained through the observations supported the questionnaire data related to learning environment to a great extent. The learning environment in the classes of TB seemed to be better organized and more effectively controlled by the teacher, while, in the classes of TA, the environment seemed to be much warmer.

Throughout the observations, it was noticed that TA interacted with the same half of the students. But in the classes of TB, the teacher addressed to different students although the number was limited. However, in the classes of TA, it was noticed that the students might easily laugh at their friends because of any mistake they did and the teacher did not warn these students. This behavior was never observed in the classes of TB.

In the opinionnaire, the students of TA claimed that from time to time, they experienced a kind of chaos in their classes while the students of TB stated that everything was in order all the time. Depending on this, more students in the classes of TB stated that they were learning more, compared to the students of TA. However, the students of TB stated that they did not want to ask the questions they had since they were not sure how their teacher might behave. On the other hand, the students of TA responded that whenever they had a question, they could easily ask the teacher.

In the opinionnaire, some students of TA complained about the relations between the teacher and the students by claiming that some students displayed disrespectful behaviors and these students were not warned by the teacher. In contrast, the students of TB found the relations too weak and the teacher too cold toward the students. The students of TA also complained about their friends' attitude toward others since from time to time they laughed at their mistakes. The students of TA stated that some students were not treated fairly when they were distributed the time to participate in the activities.

In the interviews, the students stated that when the things were in order, as in the classes of TB, they felt more secure. In addition, they responded that when they thought that they could learn something in that classroom even if the environment was found boring as in the classes of TB but they tried to do assigned tasks. The students of TA added that the arguments among friends and between the students and the teachers often led to poor learning environment since such discussions often distracted them.

Discussion

In terms of student classroom behaviors, there are more interruptions due to various misbehaviors in the classes of the low control teacher (TA) than in the classes of the high control teacher (TB). However, the students of the low control teacher (TA) try to contribute to the lesson more than those of the high control teacher (TB). On the other hand, the low control teacher-(TA) ignores the misbehaviors that occur toward the end of the lesson. Consequently, the low control teacher (TA) faces more misbehaviors and more student reluctance and his/her students are less interested in the lesson than the students of the high control teacher (TB). The low control teacher (TA) faces some problems because some students do not find their teacher effective enough to handle the problem behaviors. This finding supports the point made by Rohrkemper & Good (1988a, 1988b) on the positive effects of proactive teaching.

There is a very strict atmosphere in the classes of the high control teacher (TB). Although this atmosphere bores the students (Moskowitz & Hayman 1976), they do not dare to misbehave since they know for sure that they will be punished by the teacher, and the students do the tasks assigned to them. However, when the students in the classes of the low control teacher (TA) feel bored, they tend to misbehave since they know that they will not be punished by their teacher with a great possibility. Ignorance of some problem behaviors by

the low control teacher (TA) makes these problem behaviors widespread and difficult for the teachers to stop. This finding is in line with what McDaniel (1982) says on the likely results of teachers' firmness in applying the classroom rules, indicating that teachers' firmness gives students the message that any similar behavior will be treated similarly under similar conditions.

When the teacher reprimands students who really deserve it, the feelings of the other students toward the teacher are not negatively affected. Therefore, teachers are expected to direct their reproach to the misbehavior of the students who have misbehaved instead of the whole class. In addition, if the student who has been punished accepts his/her behavior to be wrong and the punishment to be fair, s/he conforms to the punishment as long as the teacher has attacked at their behavior instead of their personality, indicating that the teacher. The low control teacher (TA) ignores some misbehaviors which spread to some other students. Gestures and mimics are useful for preventing any misbehavior if it has not spread to the whole class yet. However, if the misbehavior is likely to disturb the other students, the teacher needs to take stronger measures such as stopping the lesson and warning the students who have misbehaved. In addition, it can be concluded that handling the misbehavior effectively often prevents similar behaviors.

As to the learning environment, the high control teacher (TB) can create a well-organized and better-controlled learning environment, which contributes to students' learning. This finding supports the discussion made by Good, Biddle and Brophy (1985) on the effects of creating a positive learning environment on students' behaviors. The low control teacher (TA) also tries to create a warm climate, which contributes positively to students' learning, but this effort of the teacher is sometimes abused by students, suggesting that the teacher be careful about the results of his behaviors to create a warm learning environment.

Also, orderliness in the class helps students feel secure. Since the students of the high control teacher (TB) and partly of the low control teacher (TA) avoid annoying the teacher or making him/her angry, the teachers feel less tense and can concentrate better on what they are doing. Nevertheless, when the students of the low control teacher (TA) find the topic boring, they do not hesitate much to misbehave since the teacher is perceived to be somewhat permissive. This finding supports what Balson (1992) suggests in the discussion related to the

reasons of student misbehaviors. Although the classes of the high control teacher (TB) are more boring, there are few behavior problems. On the other hand, the seemingly happy students of the low control teacher (TA) more often conduct disruptive behaviors. This contrast reveals that monotony in the classroom does not directly mean more behavior problems. In their discussion related to the findings from classroom management research, Evertson and Harris (1992) claim that misbehaviors do not derive only from monotony in the classroom; there are other factors contributing to student misbehaviors, indicating that teachers need to be aware of the factors that lead to student misbehaviors.

The low control teacher (TA) has more interaction with the students. However, since his/her students perceive him/her partial in distributing his/her care among the students, the teacher has a negative feedback due to his/her effort to build closer relations with the students. On the other hand, the students of the low control teacher (TA) tend to laugh at their friends' mistakes, and although the students expect their teacher to stop such misbehaviors, the teacher often ignores them, which discourages the slow learners in the class. In their discussion on student misbehaviors, Zabel and Zabel (1996) state that students' laughing at their friends discourage students who have difficulty learning. Similarly, the strict attitude of the high control teacher (TB) discourages students from participating in the activities or asking questions (Burden, 1995). The low control teacher (TA) builds too close relations with the students, which leads to students' abuse of teachers' goodwill while too formal relations of the high control teacher (TB) prevents interaction in exchange for less misbehavior. This finding supports what Crosser (1992) claims in the discussion on the relationship between teacher-student interaction and student behaviors. Finally, the low control teacher (TA) makes changes in the lesson flow when the students are distracted, and consequently attracts and motivates the students, indicating the need that the teacher should be flexible in learning activities during the lesson.

It is concluded that a well-organized and better-controlled learning environment contributes to students' learning along with a warm climate. Also, orderliness in the class helps students feel secure. When the students avoid annoying the teacher or making him/her angry, the teacher feels less tense and can concentrate better on what s/he is doing. However, when the students find the topic boring, they may tend to misbehave if the teacher is perceived to be somewhat permissive. Monotony in the class does not directly mean that

there will be a lot of misbehavior in the class since the amount of misbehavior mainly depends on how the teacher reacts to such behaviors.

The amount of interaction relaxes the students, provided that each student has equal chance of it. When the students tend to laugh at their friends' mistakes, the students expect the teacher to stop such behaviors. The strict attitude of the teacher to control the class discourages students from asking questions or participating in the classroom activities. In terms of the relations between the teacher and the students, too close relations may lead to students' abuse of the teacher's attitude while too formal relations which may decrease misbehavior may also prevent interaction. Making changes in the lesson flow when the students are distracted motivates the students.

References

- Abdullah, S. (1992). Cross-cultural understanding (sensitivity) – An overlooked aspect in language teacher training. Guidelines. 14 (2), 61-67.
- Allen, J. D. (1986). Classroom management: Students' perspectives, goals, and strategies. American Educational Research Journal. 23 (3), 437-459.
- Balson, M. (1992). Understanding classroom behavior. Australian Council for Educational Research: Hawthorn.
- Berne, E. (1964). Games people play: The psychology of human relations. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Burden, B. (1995). Classroom management and discipline: Methods to facilitate cooperation and instruction. New York: Longman.
- Cangelosi, J. S. (1988). Classroom management strategies: Gaining and maintaining students' cooperation. New York: Longman.
- Canter, L. & Canter, M. (1992). Assertive discipline: positive behavior management for today's schools (rev. ed.). Santa Monica, CA: Lee Canter & Associates.
- Charles, C. M. (1996). Building classroom discipline (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Comish, R., Rader, C. Kritsonis, W, Daboval, J. & Northam, C. (1996). National impact - a classroom trust inventory. Psychology. 33 (1) 37-40.
- Crosser, S. (1992) Managing the early childhood classrooms. Young Children. 47 (2) 23-29.

- Deng, B. (1991). A multilevel analysis of classroom climate effects on mathematics achievement of fourth-grade students. Unpublished Ed. Dissertation. Memphis State University.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.
- Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., & Pepper, F. C. (1982). Maintaining sanity in the classroom: Classroom management techniques (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Durmuşçelebi, M. (1996). "Yüksek öğretim kurumlarında öğretim elemanlarından beklenen ve gözlenen davranışların düzeylerinin belirlenmesi." Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Ellis, D. W. and Kidwell, K. P. J. (1995). A study of assertive discipline and recommendations for effective classroom management methods. Texas, US.
- Evertson, C. M. & Harris, A. H. (1992). What we know about managing classrooms. Educational Leadership. 49 (7), 74-78.
- Ginott, H. G. (1972). Teacher and child. New York: Macmillan.
- Glasser, W. (1969). Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row.
- Glasser, W. (1992). The quality school: Managing students without coercion. Harper Collins Publishers: New York.
- Good, T. L., Biddle, B. J. and Brophy, J. E. (1975). Teachers make a difference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hargraves, D. H., Hester, S. K. and Mellor (1975). Deviance in classrooms. Boston: Routhledge and Kegan Paul.
- Harris, T. A. (1967). I'm OK - You're OK. New York: Avon Books.
- Jones, F. H. (1987). Positive classroom discipline. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jones, V. F. and Jones, L. S. (1995). Comprehensive classroom management: Creating positive learning environment for all students. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kameenui, E. J. and Craig B. Darch, C. B. (1995). Instructional classroom management: A Proactive approach to behavior management. New York: Longman.
- Kısakürek, M. A. (1985). Sınıf atmosferinin öğrenci başarısına etkisi. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.

- Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and group management. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lemlech, J. K. (1988). Classroom management: Methods and techniques for elementary and secondary teachers. New York: Longman.
- Martin, N. K. & Baldwin, B. (1992). "Beliefs regarding classroom management style. The differences between preservice and experienced teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Knoxville, Louisiana.
- Martin, N. K. & Baldwin, B. (1994). "Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between novice and experienced teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association. San Antonio.
- Martin, N. K. & Yin, Z. (1997). "Attitudes and beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male and female teachers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin.
- McCloskey, C. M. (1996). Taking positive steps toward classroom management in preschool: Loosening up without letting it all fall apart. Young Children. 51 (3), 14-16.
- McDaniel, T. R. (1986). A primer on classroom discipline: Principles old and new. Phi Delta Kappan. 68 (Sept), 63-67.
- Mehan, H., Hertweck, A., Combs, S. E. and Flynn, P. J. (1982). Teachers' interpretations of students' behavior. In L. C. Wilkinson, (Ed.), Communicating in the classroom. New York: Academic Press.
- Moskowitz, G. and Hayman, J. (1976). Success strategies of inner-city teachers: A year-long study. Journal of Educational Research. 69, 285-289.
- Nash, J. W. (1991). "Organizational philosophy and reality of classroom management: Implications for the restructuring movement." Unpublished Ph. Dissertation. Vanderbilt University.
- Prosser, M. and Triggwell, K. (1997). Relations between perceptions of the teaching environment and approaches to teaching. British Journal of Educational Psychology. 67 (March), 25-35.
- Redl, E. & Wattenberg, W. W. (1959). Mental hygiene in teaching (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Redl, E. (1972). When we deal with children (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

- Rohrkemper, M. M. and Good, T. L. (1988a). Proactive teaching. In M. J. Dunkin (Ed.), The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rohrkemper, M. M. and Good, T. L. (1988b). Reactive teaching. In M. J. Dunkin (Ed.), The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Skinner, B. F. (1971). Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Knopf.
- Swick, K. J. (1987). Disruptive student behavior in the classroom: What research says to the teacher (2nd ed.). District of Colombia: US.
- Tauber, R. (1982). Negative reinforcement: A positive strategy in classroom management. Clearing House. 56, 64-67.
- Tsangaridou, N. and Osullivan, M. (1997). The role of reflection in shaping physical education teachers' educational values and practices. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 17 (1), 2-25.
- Turanlı, A. S. (1995). "Students' expectations and perceptions of teachers' classroom management behaviors." Unpublished master thesis, METU: Ankara.
- Turner, C. L. (1991). "Teachers' perceptions of effective classroom management within an inner-city middle school." Unpublished Ed. Dissertation. The University of Tennessee.
- Waxman, H. C. & Huang, S. Y. L. K. (1997). Classroom instruction and learning environment differences between effective and ineffective urban elementary school for African-American students. Urban Education. 32 (1), 7-44.
- Wolfgang, C. H. and Glickman, C. D. (1995). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wong, N. Y. & Watkins, D. (1996). Self-monitoring as a mediator of person-environment fit - An investigation of Hong-Kong Mathematics classroom environments. British Journal of Educational Psychology. 66 (June), 223-229.
- Wragg, C. M. (1995). "Classroom management: The perspectives of teachers, pupils, and researcher." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Zabel, R. H. and Zabel, M. K. (1996). Classroom management in context: Orchestrating positive learning environment. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Table 1

Student Classroom Behaviors (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	<u>Never</u> 0	<u>Rarely</u> 1	<u>Sometimes</u> 2	<u>Often</u> 3	<u>Always</u> 4	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
I willingly participate in the classroom activities.								
TA	4.7	16.3	27.9	34.9	16.3	3.42	1.10	43
TB	8.3	20.8	18.8	33.3	18.8	3.33	1.24	48
Most of the students follow the lesson flow.								
TA	.0	4.7	41.9	44.2	9.3	3.58	.73	43
TB	2.1	14.6	14.6	41.7	27.1	3.77	1.08	48
While a student speaks, the others listen.								
TA	7.1	26.2	26.2	33.3	7.1	3.07	1.09	42
TB	4.2	.0	12.5	39.6	43.8	4.19	.96	48
Students chat without permission								
TA	4.7	23.3	32.6	32.6	7.0	3.14	1.01	43
TB	43.8	39.6	12.5	4.2	.0	1.77	.83	48
Most students listen to the teacher attentively								
TA	4.7	23.3	23.3	27.9	20.9	3.37	1.20	43
TB	6.3	.0	4.2	45.8	43.8	4.21	1.01	48
The lesson flow is interrupted due to disruptive behaviors								
TA	9.3	41.9	32.6	11.6	4.7	2.60	.98	43
TB	77.1	14.6	4.2	2.1	2.1	1.38	.84	48
Certain students misbehave at any chance.								
TA	7.0	37.2	16.3	25.6	14.0	3.02	1.22	43
TB	75.0	14.6	4.2	2.1	4.2	1.46	.99	48
I avoid misbehaving.								
TA	2.3	4.7	4.7	34.9	53.5	4.33	.94	43
TB	2.1	.0	2.1	6.3	89.6	4.81	.67	48
I try to do the classroom tasks as carefully as I can.								
TA	2.3	4.7	9.3	27.9	55.8	4.30	.99	43
TB	.0	8.3	20.8	33.3	37.5	4.00	.97	48
I try to do my best to contribute to the class.								
TA	14.0	7.0	7.0	37.2	34.9	3.72	1.39	43
TB	6.3	12.5	31.3	33.3	16.7	3.42	1.11	48
When I am bored, I conduct various behaviors so that the teacher notices how I feel.								
TA	16.3	37.2	11.6	18.6	16.3	2.81	1.37	43
TB	53.2	23.4	8.5	10.6	4.3	1.89	1.20	47
I avoid behaviors which are likely to distract my friends.								
TA	2.4	4.8	28.6	16.7	47.6	4.02	1.09	42
TB	.0	.0	4.3	19.1	76.6	4.72	.54	47

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Students' Behaviors

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.52	.61	43
TB	4.16	.51	48

$t(89) = 5.45, p = .000$

Table 3

Learning Environment (in percentages, means, and standard deviations)

	<u>Never</u> 0	<u>Rarely</u> 1	<u>Sometimes</u> 2	<u>Often</u> 3	<u>Always</u> 4	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
I feel that I am learning something in the classes of this teacher.								
TA	2.4	14.6	36.6	34.1	12.2	3.39	.97	41
TB	6.4	2.1	.0	27.7	63.8	4.40	1.08	47
I can ask for help from the teacher and my friends in the classes of this teacher without feeling timid.								
TA	2.4	4.9	14.6	39.0	39.0	4.07	.98	41
TB	8.5	6.4	17.0	31.9	36.2	3.81	1.24	47
In the classes of this teacher, everything is in order.								
TA	2.4	7.3	29.3	51.2	9.8	3.59	.87	41
TB	.0	.0	4.3	40.4	55.3	4.51	.59	47
In the classes of this teacher, student-teacher relations are based on mutual respect.								
TA	7.3	2.4	22.0	41.5	26.8	3.78	1.11	41
TB	2.1	2.1	8.5	36.2	51.1	4.32	.89	47
The relations among the students are based on mutual respect in the classes of this teacher.								
TA	2.4	29.3	31.7	26.8	9.8	3.12	1.03	41
TB	4.3	4.3	17.0	34.0	40.4	4.02	1.07	47
I am happy to be in the class of this teacher.								
TA	9.8	7.3	34.1	31.7	17.1	3.39	1.16	41
TB	8.5	2.1	10.6	29.8	48.9	4.09	1.21	47
Certain students laugh at their friends because of various reasons related to the course.								
TA	7.3	17.1	36.6	22.0	17.1	3.24	1.16	41
TB	55.3	21.3	10.6	12.8	.0	1.81	1.08	47
I feel that I am unfairly treated by this teacher.								
TA	41.5	24.4	24.4	4.9	4.9	2.07	1.15	41
TB	70.2	17.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.55	1.06	47
We have enjoyable time in the classes of this teacher.								
TA	4.9	7.3	34.1	41.5	12.2	3.49	.98	41
TB	8.5	14.9	19.1	31.9	25.5	3.51	1.27	47

N's vary somewhat due to missing data.

Table 4

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores for Learning Environment

	Mean	SD	N
TA	3.50	.65	41
TB	4.14	.66	47

$t(86) = 4.61, p = .000$